## Contents

*List of boxes, figures and tables*  x

*How to use this book*  xii

*Acknowledgements*  xiv

*List of abbreviations*  xv

### 1 Introduction: The Development of Social Policy  1

- What is social policy?  2
- Fabianism and the roots of social welfare  3
- The welfare state  5
- The New Left  7
- The New Right  8
- The Third Way and the Big Society  9
- Comparative perspectives  11
- The welfare mix  13

### PART 1 Structures and Contexts  15

#### 2 The State  17

- The ‘welfare state  17
- What is the state?  20
- The functions of the state  23
- The limits of the state  25

#### 3 The Market  29

- The commercial sector  29
- The case for markets  31
- The market and the state  32
- Forms of commercial welfare  34
- Marketization  36
- Problems with markets  38
## Contents

### Part 1: Themes and Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Third Sector</td>
<td>40-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Informal Welfare</td>
<td>54-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Devolution and Local Control</td>
<td>64-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>International and European Influences</td>
<td>83-98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 2: Key Policy Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>103-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health and illness</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health needs</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The development of the National Health Service</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A patient-led health service</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raising standards, involving users</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting health and wellbeing</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paying for health services</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Houses or homes?</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supply and demand</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paying for housing</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing policy in the twentieth century</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recent housing policy</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing provision</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Social Care Services</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is social care?</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The structure of care services</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The development of care services</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children's services</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult services</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding adult care</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is education?</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The structure of provision</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education in schools and early years provision</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further and continuing education</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equality and selectivity in education</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards and performance management</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancillary services</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing employment policy</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy context</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labour markets</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welfare to work</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment protection</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Contents

## PART 3  Theories and Debates  

### 14 Ideologies of Welfare  
- Ideology  
- Theory and politics  
- Neoliberalism  
- The Middle Way  
- Social democracy  
- Marxism  
- New social movements  
- Postmodernism  

### 15 Economic Development  
- The economic context  
- Capitalism  
- Classical economics  
- Keynesianism  
- The collapse of Keynesianism  
- Monetarism  
- Supply-side economics  
- Globalism and recession  
- Stability and prudence  
- The credit crunch  
- Public austerity  

### 16 Paying for Welfare  
- The cost of welfare  
- Public expenditure  
- Sources of funding  

### 17 Social Divisions  
- A divided society  
- Class  
- Gender  
- Race and ethnicity  
- Age  
- Disability  

### 18 Delivering Welfare  
- Access to welfare  
- Whose welfare?  
- New Public Management  
- Audit and inspection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modernization and governance</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening up public services</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19 The Future of Social Policy</strong></td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past achievements</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future prospects</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social policy is a unique subject, but is closely linked to the other social sciences and studied by students undertaking a wide range of social science courses and professional qualifications.

Over time the scope of analysis and debate in the subject has broadened, captured in the change in title from social administration to social policy.

Academic study of social policy has always been closely linked to policy practice, with leading academics sometimes acting as advisers to government.

The creation of the ‘welfare state’ by the post-war Labour government established public services to meet welfare needs.

Criticisms of state welfare from the New Left and the New Right have argued that the continued expansion of state welfare is not sustainable. In the last quarter of the last century this seemed to be borne out as an economic crisis led to retrenchment in social policy planning and welfare expenditure.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century a Third Way, between the left and the right, was championed by government in the UK.

Following the economic recession of 2008/09 there has been pressure to reduce public spending on welfare provision in the UK, and elsewhere.

Social policy can no longer be studied solely within national boundaries, and comparative analysis of welfare in different countries has revealed that in different countries there are different mixes of welfare services.

It is how this ‘welfare mix’ operates, and changes, in Britain that is the core concern of students of social policy.

This mix also varies within Britain now, as a result of the devolution of much social policy planning to the separate administrations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.
WHAT IS SOCIAL POLICY?

Social policy is an academic subject, studied by students on undergraduate and postgraduate degree programmes and in a number of areas of professional training. It is also studied by some students at A level or in further education; but for the most part social policy study takes place in universities and other higher education institutions. Social policy can be studied as a discrete subject, on a ‘single honours’ programme; but there are many other students (indeed the large majority) studying the subject as one element in a broader social studies programme, or as part of a related programme in sociology or political science or, as mentioned above, as part of a programme of professional training – for instance, in social work, health science, housing or planning.

Social policy is also, however, the term used to refer to the actions taken within society to develop and deliver services for people in order to meet their needs for welfare and wellbeing. Social policy is thus both the name of the academic subject and the focus of what is studied. Thus sociologists study society, whilst social policy students study social policy. This may seem confusing, but it need not be. Indeed the terminological link between what we study and what we do makes clear the link between analysis and practice which is what attracts many people into social policy, as we shall discuss below.

Studying social policy alongside other subjects such as sociology or economics also raises questions about the extent to which social policy is a discrete subject, or discipline, as academics sometimes call them. It is likely that there will always be argument and debate about what constitutes an academic subject, and in social science, in particular, there is debate about the overlap between subjects such as sociology, economics, politics and social policy, and about what should be the core concerns of each. Certainly social policy overlaps with other subjects, such as these and others like social work or criminology; and this has led some to question whether social policy is an interdisciplinary field rather than a discrete academic subject. This is not a terribly fruitful debate, however, for disciplinary boundaries are disputed in all academic subjects, and interdisciplinary work is widely promoted across the social sciences.

In most British universities social policy in fact often shares departmental status with cognate social sciences such as sociology, or with professional education such as social work, and the teaching of these is generally closely related, with social policy included in all. And in research institutes specialists in social policy often work alongside sociologists, economists, statisticians and even lawyers. However, within this broader context some key features do delineate social policy. Where it differs from sociology, for instance, is in its specific focus upon the development and implementation of policy measures in order to influence the social circumstances of individuals rather than the more general study of those social circumstances themselves. And, where it differs from economics, is in its focus upon welfare policies, or policies impacting upon the welfare of citizens, rather than those seeking to influence the production of goods, materials and services.

What is more, if we move on to examine the historical development of social policy, we can see how these issues have been played out – how the attempt to provide a specific focus for study was embarked upon, how this led to boundary disputes with other subjects, how it was subject to external political influence and to internal theoretical debate, and how these events changed the nature of social policy itself. In fact, debates over the nature of social policy even resulted in a change in name for the subject from social administration to social policy, symbolized by the change of the professional association, representing academics and researchers in universities, from the Social Administration Association to the Social Policy Association (SPA) in 1987. This was a change that was not without conflict and disagreement (see Glennerster 1988; Smith 1988; Donnison 1994). Nor is it necessarily complete, and some university departments and qualifications are still referred to as social administration.

Within the British social policy tradition in particular, what has also distinguished social policy from some other social science subjects has been its specific, and driving, concern not merely to understand the world, but also to change it. In this tradition social policy is not only
a descriptive subject, it is also a prescriptive one. This is in part because the early academic development of social policy in Britain was closely allied to the political development of Fabianism. The Fabians were both academics and politicians, and they wanted to utilize academic research and analysis in order to influence government welfare policy. Throughout much of the early part of last century the development of British social policy was often synonymous with the concerns and perspectives of the Fabians; and the subject largely shared Fabianism’s benign view of the role of state provision within welfare policy. Social policy also shared the empirical focus of Fabianism, in particular its concern to measure the need for, and the impact of, state welfare provision.

The ideological and empirical alliances with Fabianism were, however, associated most closely with the social administration perspective of the subject, and with a concern with what is done by policy action, and how it is done, rather than why this is done, or indeed whether it should be done. This narrower focus has come under critical scrutiny as the academic subject has developed over the last 50 years or so. Of particular importance in this process of development was the work of Richard Titmuss, the first Professor of Social Administration, who was appointed at the London School of Economics (LSE) in 1950. In his inaugural lecture at the LSE Titmuss described social policy as ‘the study of the social sciences whose object… is the improvement of the conditions of life of the individual in the setting of family and group relations’ (1958). This included a commitment to prescription (improving living conditions) and to an understanding of social context. These concerns were taken up by Titmuss in his later work, which remains the most influential legacy of conceptual reflection and empirical analysis within the subject, both within the UK and beyond (see Alcock et al. 2001). Titmuss was especially concerned, however, to argue that the role of academic study was to explore the values that lay behind policy decisions and the research evidence that should shed light on these, rather than to extol the virtues of particular policy changes. It is this reflective approach which led him to challenge some of the narrower perceptions of the achievements of the Fabian-inspired welfare reforms of post-war Britain, and which still provides an inspiration to critical judgement amongst students of the subject today.

In the latter half of the twentieth century the narrow focus of the Fabian tradition upon how to improve existing welfare services thus began to come under increasing criticism and attack from different perspectives which sought to widen the questions asked by the subject and to challenge the underlying assumption of the benign role of the state in welfare provision. Furthermore, the narrow focus and assumptions of the social administration tradition have also been called into question by the increasing academic and political concern with international comparisons of welfare policy. For what international comparisons quickly reveal, as Titmuss again was influential in pointing out, is that welfare policies have not developed elsewhere as they have done in Britain; that different political assumptions in different countries have led to different patterns of provision; and, therefore, that different political assumptions could lead to different patterns of provision in Britain too.

The cumulative effect of these questions and challenges has been to bring about a significant shift in the focus of academic debate and political influence within the subject, which has been represented by the change in title from administration to policy. This has resulted in a shift from a subject that was, in Mishra’s (1989) terms, ‘pragmatic, Britain-centred, socially concerned and empirical’, to one that is characterized by ideological division, theoretical pluralism and a growing internationalism. However, this shift, significant though it is, should not deter us from recognizing the continuities, as well as the discontinuities, in the development of social policy.

**FABIANISM AND THE ROOTS OF SOCIAL WELFARE**

The concern of social policy writers to contribute to the development of political change – as well as to analyse it – has been a key feature since its birth as a subject in Britain. Interest in
it began to develop at a time when state policy towards the welfare of citizens was undergoing a radical revision and Fabian politics were seeking both to understand and influence this. The Fabian Society was formed in 1884, under the leading guidance of Sidney and Beatrice Webb who were firm believers that collective provision for welfare through the state was an essential, and inevitable, development within British capitalist society; Sidney Webb also held strong views on the moral values of social (or socialist) provision (Headlam 1892; Ball 1896).

One of the early examples of the influence of Fabian thinking was within the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and the Relief of Distress, of which Beatrice Webb was a member. The Commission was established by the government, in 1905, to review the old Victorian approach to support for the poor. It signified a recognition by government of the need to overhaul welfare policies and the importance of social policy debate in shaping this process, and it increased the pressure on government to bring about the major changes in social security and other policies that were introduced in the ten years before the First World War.

Debate about the future direction of welfare policy was a central concern of the work of the Commission, and when it reported in 1909 the Commission produced both a Majority and Minority Report, as the members could not all agree about the role that the state should play as provider of welfare services. The Minority Report was largely written by the Webbs and argued for an extensive role for state provision. The Majority Report envisaged a greater, continuing, role for charitable and voluntary action. Nevertheless, both argued for significant reform and in retrospect there was as much in common as there was in conflict between them; and, as we shall see in Part 1 in particular, both state and voluntary action have played significant roles in the subsequent development of social policy.

Influential in the drafting of the Majority Report were Charles Booth and Bernard and Helen Bosanquet, leading members of the Charity Organisation Society (COS), which coordinated much of voluntary sector provision of social work and social services and the training of social workers. In December 1912, however, the COS’s School of Sociology was merged with the LSE, founded by the Webbs, to form the LSE’s new Department of Social Science and Administration. This was arguably the first academic base for the study of social policy and it provided a significant academic forum for developing the debates rehearsed in the Commission’s deliberations. The first lecturer to be appointed to the new department in 1913 was Clement Attlee, demonstrating almost immediately the close link that the Fabians were concerned to secure between academic analysis and political change because, after the Second World War, Attlee became the Prime Minister of the Labour government which introduced many of the far-reaching state welfare reforms that the Fabian reformers had been calling for throughout the intervening period.

During the early part of the twentieth century the LSE Department of Social Science and Administration also received significant financial support from the private trusts of an Indian millionaire, Ratan Tata. This money was specifically tied to support for empirical research on policies for the prevention and relief of poverty and destitution. It therefore provided an impetus for the development of another significant aspect of the subject: its concern with empirical work on the need for, and impact of, social policy. In particular, the research funding supported the work of academics such as Tawney, and Bowley and Burnett Hurst, who were early pioneers in the theoretical and empirical investigation of poverty and inequality in Britain (Harris 1989).

During the period following the First World War, therefore, the department at the LSE contained the main themes of the subject of social policy in its early form. It was informed, and directed, by a strong ideological commitment to Fabianism, in particular the use of academic knowledge and research on social problems to create pressure on the state to introduce welfare reforms. The continuing influence of the old COS, however, also maintained a concern with the role of the voluntary sector in social service and, although diminished by the statism of the Fabian approach, this broader concern with non-state welfare provision has always remained a vital feature of political as well as academic debate in social policy.
Teaching at the LSE, although also informed by sociology and economics, remained firmly tied to the education and training of social services workers, however; and research work focused on the detailed investigation of the problem of poverty. Despite the high-profile political context of its birth in the early twentieth century, when the Webbs and the Bosanquets were influential in shaping the reform of Victorian welfare policy in Britain, social policy soon became more concerned with the pragmatic issues of education for practice and empirical research on established social problems (the social administration tradition).

THE WELFARE STATE

In the period following the Second World War this tradition reached what was perhaps its high-water mark with the creation of what has often been referred to as a ‘welfare state’ in Britain. The development of this welfare state owed much, in principle at least, to the influence of the Beveridge Report of 1942. Beveridge (himself Director of the LSE for a time between the wars) had been appointed by the wartime government to conduct a review of social security policy. However, when his report appeared, at around the time of one of the earliest allied victories at El Alamein, it included, alongside a detailed blueprint for the reform of benefits, a vision for a much broader role for the state in meeting collective welfare need, captured in his famous reference to the need for public action to remove the ‘five giant evils’ that had haunted the country before the war: disease, idleness, ignorance, squalor and want.

Beveridge’s report was a best-seller, and it set the scene for debate about policy development after the war. Reforms were introduced by the post-war Attlee government to combat Beveridge’s evils through state action:

- The National Health Service (NHS) to combat disease
- Full employment to combat idleness
- State education to fifteen to combat ignorance (actually introduced in 1944 by the wartime National Government)
- Public housing to combat squalor
- The National Insurance (NI) and Assistance schemes to combat want.

At the same time local authority (LA) children’s and mental health departments introduced comprehensive social service provision too. All of these policy changes, and the subsequent development of them, are discussed in more detail in Part 2.

This was probably the most intensive period of social policy reform ever experienced in the UK. The head of the LSE Department of Social Science and Administration at the time was T. H. Marshall. In a famous treatise on citizenship (1950) he argued that the earlier development of civil and political citizenship in British society had been complemented in the mid-twentieth century by the creation of social citizenship. With the expansion of public funding for comprehensive state services it is easy to see how this embodiment of social citizenship and the new role that it included for the state as the provider of social services came to be seen as the creation of a welfare state.

Furthermore, the post-war welfare state appeared to have widespread political and ideological support. Although most of the reforms were introduced by the Labour government elected in 1945, when Labour were replaced by the Conservatives in 1951, the state welfare services were maintained in almost exactly the same form. The general assumption was that there was a political consensus over the desirability of state welfare provision within a capitalist economy. In 1954 The Economist magazine coined the phrase Butskellism to refer to this consensus, which was an amalgamation of the names of the Labour Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gaitskell, and his Conservative successor, Butler (also the author of the 1944 education reform) (Dutton 1991). This consensus seemed to represent an accommodation in Conservative thinking to the role of state intervention, referred to by Macmillan as The Middle
Way (1938), and a recognition in Labour thinking of the abandonment of the need for a future socialist revolution (Crosland 1956; Addison 1975). All the post-war governments and prime ministers are listed in Table 1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Prime Minister 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945–50</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Attlee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950–51</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Attlee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951–55</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Churchill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955–59</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Eden/Macmillan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959–64</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Macmillan/Douglas-Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964–66</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966–70</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970–74</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974–79</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Wilson/Callaghan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979–83</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Thatcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983–87</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Thatcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987–92</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Thatcher/Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992–97</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–2001</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–05</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–10</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Blair/Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–</td>
<td>Coalition (Conservative and Liberal Democrat)</td>
<td>Cameron</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The welfare state and the post-war consensus may be seen as significant achievements for social policy but they also presented the subject with something of a challenge, for in a sense they removed the need for further academic and ideological debate and therefore the main basis for future political influence. In the period following the introduction of the welfare state, social work practice and training became more and more concerned with the individualistic, psychoanalytical approach to social problems; voluntary sector activity began relatively to decline; and policy research became restricted to the narrow role of gathering facts to support the case for the gradual expansion and greater effectivity of the now-established agencies of state welfare. The success of Fabianism therefore meant that social policy debate ran the risk of being restricted to analysis and improvement of existing welfare services.

Such a narrow consensual approach was not without its critics, however (see Lowe 1990). In particular the work of Titmuss challenged the supposed comprehensive nature of the new state services and their assumed egalitarian consequences, pointing out that support also took place outside state services and frequently selectively benefited the rich rather than the poor, and directly questioning the concept of the ‘welfare state’ itself (see Alcock et al. 2001). Evidence of the limitations of state welfare was also developed by Titmuss’s colleagues at the LSE. For instance, Townsend and Abel-Smith conducted research, which showed that, despite the welfare reforms to combat want, many people were still living in poverty in Britain in the 1950s and 1960s (Abel-Smith and Townsend 1965; Townsend 1979).
Comprehension Questions

Why did social administration change its name to social policy?

What is ‘Fabianism’, and to what extent did Fabian thinking dominate the development of British social policy in the last century?

Reflective Question

What are the implications for students and practitioners of the recognition that social policy is a prescriptive subject?

The New Left

Towards the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, the rapid expansion of higher education saw social policy becoming established as an academic subject in most British universities and expanding its research base with increased state and charitable support for an ever wider range of projects on the implementation of state welfare. In 1967 the professional association was established, and in 1971 a major academic journal for the subject was launched: the Journal of Social Policy (JSP).

However, the expansion of social policy also brought into the subject a wider range of academics and practitioners, not all of whom shared the Fabian perspective or the LSE roots of its earlier members. The late 1960s and early 1970s was a period of the renaissance of Marxist and other radical debate within the social sciences in most welfare capitalist countries, referred to by many of the leading protagonists as the New Left. The expanding base of social policy brought this debate into the politics and ideology of welfare too.

Marxist theorizing covered a range of different, and disputed, approaches to social structure and social policy but, in general, there was agreement among many that the achievement of the welfare state in post-war Britain and the Fabian-supported consensus on the gradual and unilinear growth of welfare protection were neither as successful, nor as desirable, as had been assumed. Pointing to the empirical work of Titmuss, Townsend and others, Marxists argued that the welfare state had not succeeded in solving the social problems of those in poverty and the broader working class and, in practice, operated to support capitalism rather than to challenge it (Ginsburg 1979). They argued, therefore, for a rejection of the consensual, Fabian, approach to the understanding of, and support for, state welfare and its replacement with a political economy of the welfare state (Gough 1979), which situated the explanation of the growth of state welfare in the needs of the capitalist economy for healthy and educated workers and the struggle of the working class for concessions from the capitalist state (sometimes referred to as the social wage).
By the 1980s the influence of the left was no longer a ‘new’ feature of the subject; theoretical debate between Marxists and Fabians about the desirability, or the compatibility, of their different approaches to the subject ranged widely (Taylor-Gooby and Dale 1981). In 1981 a new journal, Critical Social Policy (CSP), was launched to provide a forum for such debates and for other alternative approaches to theory and research in social policy.

The New Left critics challenged the theoretical assumptions of the post-war consensus approach to state welfare, arguing for a conflict model that saw welfare reforms as the product of struggle and compromise rather than gradual enlightenment (Saville 1983). They also challenged the assumed desirability of state welfare services, arguing that for many working-class people welfare services such as council housing or social security were experienced as oppressive and stigmatizing. These criticisms were not only informed by Marxism: the pages of CSP, in particular, were also filled with academics and practitioners arguing that state welfare was also failing women, ethnic minorities and other oppressed or marginalized social groups (an issue to which we shall return in Chapter 17).

It is perhaps no coincidence that the New Left challenge to the Fabian domination of social policy was occurring at more or less the same time as the welfare state itself was also under threat from Britain’s changing economic and political fortunes. The failure of economic growth in the 1970s discussed in Chapter 15 to continue to provide a platform for expanding state welfare was argued by Marxists to be an inevitable consequence of the inability to reform capitalism from within and was evidence that the process was beginning to experience a ‘crisis’ in which stark choices would have to be faced by social policy planners and politicians (see Mishra 1984). However, the crisis – if crisis it was – in state welfare of the 1970s not only attracted a critical reappraisal of the Fabian domination of social policy from the left, but it also provoked a counter-attack from right-wing theorists.

THE NEW RIGHT

Despite the overriding influence of Fabianism within social policy, especially during the immediate post-war period, right-wing critics of state welfare had always argued against the interference of state provision with the workings of a capitalist market economy (Hayek 1944). During the 1950s, through the work of organizations such as the Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA), the appeal for a ‘return’ to the classic liberal values of a laissez-faire state and self-protecting families and communities was kept alive, if rather marginalized from mainstream social policy debate. In the 1970s, however, the crisis in the welfare state created circumstances in which such right-wing critics of state welfare could present a more cogent attack on Butskellism. What is more, this academic attack was accompanied by a shift to the right in politics too, exemplified by the election of Margaret Thatcher as leader of the Conservative Party in 1975. Together these changes provided an opportunity towards the end of the last century for a new liberalism (neoliberalism) to rise to a prominence in academic and political debate that it had not achieved at any time in the previous 80 years.

Drawing on the work of right-wing American theorists such as Friedman (1962) and Murray (1984), the IEA (now Civitas) and others began to develop a neoliberal critique of state welfare and Fabian politics that both they, and their left-wing critics, began to refer to as the New Right. Not of course that these views were that new either, as we shall discuss in Chapter 14, they drew on classical liberal thinking from the nineteenth century and before. Their main argument was that state intervention to provide welfare services, and the gradual expansion of these which Fabianism sought, drove up the cost of public expenditure to a point at which it began to interfere with the effective operation of a market economy (Bacon and Eltis 1976). They claimed that this was a point that had already been reached in Britain in the 1970s as the high levels of taxation needed for welfare services had reduced profits, crippled investment and driven capital overseas – concerns which resurfaced after the 2008 recession.
Like the New Left, the New Right also challenged the desirability of state welfare in practice, arguing that free welfare services only encouraged feckless people to become dependent upon them and provided no incentive for individuals and families to protect themselves through savings or insurance (Boyson 1971). Furthermore, right-wing theorists claimed that state monopoly over welfare services reduced the choices available to people to meet their needs in a variety of ways and merely perpetuated professionalism and bureaucracy (Green 1987).

After 1979, once the Conservative Party under Thatcher’s leadership came into power, these academic arguments found a sympathetic hearing from government ministers such as Keith Joseph and Rhodes Boyson. However, the more extreme forms of New Right thinking never completely dominated the Conservative governments of the 1980s and 1990s. Even under Thatcher the influence of the right (dubbed the dries) was to some extent counter-balanced by those more sympathetic to a continuing role for the state (the wets); and although, as we shall see in Part 2, significant reforms were made to many public welfare services, the basic principles of comprehensive public services for health, education, social security and social services remained largely intact. Thatcher herself was removed from power in 1990 and after that the Conservative government adopted a more pragmatic approach under John Major.

THE THIRD WAY AND THE BIG SOCIETY

By the 1990s, therefore, the domination that Fabianism had enjoyed over social policy had been overturned from two contradictory directions and, at the same time, its influence on government through support for the Butskellite consensus had been displaced by a political climate in which controversy was widely preached and the value of traditional academic analysis and empirical research openly questioned.

Furthermore, it was not just those from the left and right of the political spectrum who were challenging the consensual approach to welfare: other critical perspectives too were questioning the central role of Fabianism and the benign view of state welfare. Feminist writers began to question what they claimed was the male domination of academic social policy and the assumptions about unequal gender roles that were contained in much practical social policy provision (Wilson 1977; Dale and Foster 1986). In a critical reappraisal of social policy analysis throughout the post-war period Williams (1989) argued that both the gender and racial (or racist) dimensions of policy practice had been largely ignored by mainstream debate; and, as we shall see in Chapter 17, the importance of other social divisions has also now come to influence academic argument and policy development. This wider range of critical perspectives has also opened up a debate about the extent to which complex social organizations and social processes could ever be captured within the simplistic left/right dichotomies that had had such a dominant influence over policy debate throughout much of the last century. Within a modern (or perhaps a ‘postmodern’) society it was argued there are many contradictory and conflicting influences on social policy and no one approach can meet all needs in all circumstances (see Chapter 14).

The abandonment of old certainties had also influenced political and policy development by the beginning of the twenty-first century. When Tony Blair became leader of the Labour Party in 1994 he began a thorough review of past policy priorities, which led to a rebranding of the party as New Labour and a rejection of many of the state welfare commitments of past Labour governments. Drawing on a distinction developed by a Commission on Social Justice (Borrie 1994) appointed by his predecessor John Smith, Blair argued that New Labour should reject both right-wing pro-market approaches and old left support for monopolistic state services in favour of a Third Way for policy development, located between the state and the market (Blair 1998). When Labour came to power in 1997 this new approach quickly came to dominate both political debate and policy practice in the UK.
However, it was not just within the UK that a third way for welfare reform was promoted at the beginning of the new century. Some of Labour’s early policy prescriptions owed much to the reforms developed by the Clinton administration in the USA. In Europe too Third Way principles were espoused, most notably by the Social Democratic government in Germany under Schröder, which referred to this as Die Neue Mitte (the new middle); and this approach largely survived Schröder’s loss of power in 2006.

The Labour government’s embrace of a third way in the UK was in part based on a recognition of a changed understanding of the more complex make-up of modern societies, drawing on the work of Giddens (1998, 2002, 2007), a close adviser to Blair. In part, however, it was also a product of a more pragmatic approach to policy-making and service delivery, captured by the government slogan ‘what counts is what works’. Rather than assuming that services are best provided by the state (the old, Fabian, left) or the market (the New Right), the Labour government claimed to be concerned only with what was the most effective way to meet the needs of citizens; and this was a practical judgement based on empirical evidence of effectiveness rather than any ideological commitment to any particular form of provision.

As policies developed in the new century, there was increasing debate, therefore, about the extent to which the Third Way was a new philosophy for welfare provision in (post)modern society or merely an eclectic pragmatism within which different mixes of provision and organization might be supported at particular times or in different particular circumstances. This is a debate upon which social policy academics take both sides (see Powell 1999, 2002, 2008; Driver and Martell 2006; Page 2007). Nevertheless it is possible to identify some key themes that informed UK policy development under Labour:

- A shift from negative to positive welfare – the expectation that citizens should take some responsibility for planning and meeting welfare needs
- A focus on the funding of services by different providers rather than automatic provision by the state, with audit and inspection to ensure that basic standards are maintained
- A focus upon the needs, and the preferences or choices, of the consumers of welfare and a rejection of uniform and undifferentiated service provision.

When Brown succeeded Blair as Labour Prime Minister this policy direction continued largely unabated. It was also taken up to some extent by the Conservative Party in opposition once David Cameron became leader in 2005. Cameron was keen to distance the Conservatives from the New Right politics of the Thatcher era and position them as a centre-right party to challenge New Labour (Bochel 2011); and in the 2010 general election this proved successful – to some extent – as Labour lost the election and the Conservatives emerged as the largest party in the Commons. However, the Conservatives could not govern alone and therefore formed a Coalition government with the Liberal Democrats, the first formal coalition since the Second World War (Lee and Beech 2011).

Coalition with the Liberal Democrats further reinforced the Conservatives’ move to the centre ground of British politics, reinforcing a reverse from the more conflictual politics that had developed in the 1970s and 1980s. Once he took over as Prime Minister, Cameron sought to promote the new political approach of the Coalition government particularly to welfare provision in England by referring to it as creating the Big Society. This was a concept he and the Conservatives had developed in opposition, although the Liberal leader, Clegg, also embraced it in government. Like New Labour’s Third Way, it was intended to capture the Conservatives’ rejection of both monopoly public services (the ‘big state’) and unfettered free markets, which some argued had caused the economic recession (see Chapter 15). However, like the Third Way, it was also rather vague and could be used to cover a range of policy developments.

Like New Labour, the Big Society embraced changes in the ‘welfare mix’ to encourage private and voluntary organizations to take over delivery of welfare services from the state, and an increasing focus upon consumer choice as the key driver for the development of provision. The Big Society also continued Labour’s emphasis on the positive role of citizens in
meeting their own welfare needs, but sought to extend this beyond policies to encourage job seeking (see Chapter 13) to promote citizen and community based initiatives to define and deliver a wide range of welfare services locally. Also referred to as ‘localism’ the Coalition policy agenda therefore aimed to shift the balance of power in policy-making and delivery away from central government and towards local citizens. As this was being developed at the same time as the severe reductions in public provision discussed in Chapter 15, however, some critics argued that the Big Society was little more than a cover for welfare cuts. Nevertheless, the Labour opposition also supported aspects of the Big Society, pointing out that many features continued initiatives they had developed in power.

This provided further signs of a return to a more consensual middle ground in social policy in the early years of the twenty-first century. Although, as with the Butskellite consensus of the post-war years, it was not without difference and disagreement, in particular over the scale of reductions in public expenditure needed to respond to the economic crisis and the value of public provision within the Big Society. Following devolution there were also differences in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, where the Big Society agenda did not catch on and support for public service provision remained relatively stronger.

COMPREHENSION QUESTIONS

- To what extent were the New Left and the New Right critics of state welfare arguing that public provision for welfare was incompatible with the effective operation of a capitalist market economy?
- In what ways is the Coalition’s Big Society different from Labour’s Third Way?

REFLECTIVE QUESTION

- Has a new consensus on welfare policy in the UK emerged at the beginning of the new century?

COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES

Throughout much of its early development social policy had remained, like many other academic subjects in the social sciences, concerned almost exclusively with policy change and policy implementation in Britain. This is perhaps understandable, for Britain has had a more or less self-contained social and legal order and a government with the power to introduce policies affecting the lives of all people in the country. British social policy students thus studied Britain, and the description of, and the prescription for, welfare policy focused primarily on Britain and its government. However, as we are all now very much aware, the lives of people in Britain are not only affected by the decisions and actions of British governments.

In the twenty-first century we live in what is an increasingly globalized world order, where the power and influence of major international companies is greater than that of many individual nation states. As we discuss in Chapter 15, no government, including the British one, can now operate independently of such global forces. Furthermore, as we shall see in Chapter 7, major decisions on economic and social development, affecting people in many countries, are taken on an international scale by bodies operating over and above the remit of national governments, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Of particular importance for the UK is the European Union (EU) of which Britain is a member, and within which the decisions taken by the representative bodies of the EU have a direct impact upon policy development in its member nations. Social policies in Britain are thus no longer exclusively British – if indeed they ever really were – and the
subject of social policy has been required to recognize, and to analyse, this broader international dimension.

Both left- and right-wing critics of Fabian social policy were, of course, able to point to the lessons that could be learned from policy development in other countries. Some of those on the left looked to the socialist countries of the Soviet bloc although, even before the collapse of Soviet socialism, others were drawing attention instead to the social democratic countries of Scandinavia as models for welfare reform in Britain. Those on the right used the Soviet bloc as a negative example, and argued rather for policy changes modelled on the market-oriented welfare provisions found in the USA. What was clear to all was that the welfare policies, or the welfare states, of other countries demonstrated that social policies did not have to be as they were in Britain. Recognition of the importance of international comparison radically changes the focus of debate within social policy; but it, too, is not without its problems and disagreements. For a start, much of the early development of social policy in Britain had been presented as a gradual extension of state welfare, as if driven by a kind of inexorable law of progress, and tempered only by questions of speed, not direction. International comparisons initially tended to be dominated by similar assumptions. The expectation was that other countries would be following the same pattern of state welfare growth as Britain, albeit perhaps at a different pace. This assumption of international congruity is sometimes called a convergence thesis, because all nations are assumed to be converging towards one common goal.

Although it is true that most developed countries have introduced policies to make some provision for the welfare of citizens, this convergence thesis can, however, only be sustained at a level of massive simplification. More detailed study of the welfare policies of other countries, even of Britain’s nearby neighbours in the EU, reveals significant differences in the form, and the extent, of social policies, and in the political pressures that have given rise to them (George and Taylor-Gooby 1996; Bonoli et al. 2000; Taylor-Gooby 2004; Castles et al. 2010). By the 1980s social policy scholars in Britain and elsewhere were increasingly concerned to make such international comparisons, not merely in order to argue for the importation into Britain of models of welfare provision from other countries, but rather to demonstrate, at a more general theoretical and empirical level, the widespread diversity within welfare states. They sought, in effect, to challenge the convergence thesis with a celebration of difference, or a divergence thesis (Mishra 1990; and see Alcock and Craig 2009; Alcock and Powell 2011).

The development of comparative analysis in social policy can be traced back in particular to the work of Titmuss, who did much to promote policy development in other countries and developed an approach to comparative study of welfare states using three models drawn from the different value positions underlying their development (Titmuss 1974). Perhaps the most influential contribution to comparative analysis, and to the divergence thesis, however, has come from the Scandinavian academic, Esping-Andersen (1990). Esping-Andersen carried out a detailed study of the welfare states of a number of developed welfare capitalist countries, concluding that the different developments could be roughly grouped into different types of welfare regime, as we explore in more detail in Chapter 7. Esping-Andersen’s regime approach has dominated comparative social policy study over two decades, and has revealed that comparative analysis can draw on both theoretical analysis and empirical data to help us to understand better the different ways in which policy develops in different contexts.

Comparative analysis is no longer just a concern for students of social policy at international level, however. Since the devolution of politics and policy-making to the new administrations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland in 1999, different welfare regimes have been developing to some extent within the UK too. The impact of this devolution is discussed in more detail in Chapter 6, and the important differences in policy that have developed in the new century are mentioned throughout the text. It is important to remember though that these ‘internal’ differences can form an interesting basis for comparative understanding of how policies are changed and developed from what was before 1999 largely common base; and analysis of this UK dimension to policy divergence is now beginning to emerge (see Lodge and Schmuecker 2010).
THE WELFARE MIX

What the different forms of welfare regime to be found in other countries reveal, of course, is that welfare policies develop in different ways in different social, economic and political contexts. These differences also reveal a varying balance within different regimes between the place of the state in the provision of welfare, for example, with public welfare playing a major role in social democratic regimes such as Sweden and the private market playing a major role in liberal regimes such as the USA. It is not, however, only the balance between the state and the market which varies between different regimes. In corporatist regimes such as Germany, considerable emphasis is placed on the informal role of family structures in providing welfare support (for instance, in the care of children or the long-term chronically sick). In other regimes, such as the ‘welfare societies’ of some Mediterranean countries including Greece and Spain, many welfare services are provided by voluntary agencies including churches and other religious organizations.

In other words, in different welfare states there is a variation between the roles of different sectors in the provision of welfare services. We shall return in Part 1 to look at the roles of these different sectors, in Britain in particular, in more detail. However, it is important to recognize here that it is not just that the balance between the different sectors varies between different welfare states, or welfare regimes, but also that this balance may vary within any one welfare state over time (especially, of course, if that welfare state is experiencing a move from one regime to another). Indeed, it is primarily upon the balance between the roles of the different sectors of welfare that the nature of the welfare regime in any one country at any one time can be determined; and in all regimes there will inevitably be such a balance.

Despite the public welfare reforms which established the ‘welfare state’ in Britain in the 1940s and pro-market reforms of the New Right in the 1980s, welfare services in this country have in practice remained a mixture of state, market, voluntary and informal provision. Furthermore, the balance of this mixture has changed over time, with private market and other non-state forms of welfare growing in importance since the end of the last century. The general point is, however, that there has always been a balance between the providers of services. Some commentators have referred to this as a mixed economy of welfare, and argued that this welfare mix is actually a more accurate term to describe the overall nature of provision in Britain, and elsewhere, than the welfare state (Powell 2007).

The welfare mix has also now received formal political recognition in the Third Way policies developed by New Labour and the Coalition government’s Big Society. Concern to encourage public services to be delivered by a range of providers has led to support for new forms of market provision (for private pensions), voluntary activity (delivery of health and social care by non-profit organizations) and informal welfare (continuing reliance upon family support for vulnerable citizens). The Labour Prime Minister, Tony Blair, argued that government should be ‘a partner to strong communities’ (1998: 7); and the Coalition government has pledged to put the Big Society ‘at the heart of public sector reform’ (Cabinet Office 2010a).

Most commentators would probably now agree that welfare services in Britain, as in all other welfare capitalist societies, are best described as a welfare mix, with different elements delivered in different measure by different means. The role of social policy analysis therefore is to study the development and operation of these measures and these means and to use theoretical argument and empirical research to seek to influence them. This requires:

- awareness of the structures and contexts within which social policies are developed and delivered
- knowledge of the aims and features of key areas of policy practice
- understanding of the theories and debates which underpin policy development and of the important issues which affect the availability and use of services.

It is these different dimensions of analysis that will be taken up in the next three sections of this book.
COMPREHENSION QUESTIONS

- What is the difference between convergence and divergence approaches to comparative analysis of developments in the international context for welfare policy?
- What is a ‘mixed economy of welfare’?

REFLECTIVE QUESTION

- Does it make any sense now to refer to Britain as having a ‘welfare state’?

FURTHER READING

There is no book dealing directly with the development of the study of social policy. However, Bulmer, Lewis and Piachaud (1989) provide an interesting history of the development of the work of the academic department at the LSE; and Alcock et al. (2001) collect together (with commentaries) the key works of its leading scholar Titmuss. Alcock et al. (2012) provides a wide range of contributions from leading authors on social policy; and Baldock et al. (2011) is a more detailed edited collection of chapters on key areas of welfare policy. There are also larger edited collections covering social policy analysis at an international level: Castles et al. (2010) includes new contributions from across the world and Alcock and Powell (2011) is a compendium of previously published material.

Powell and Hewitt (2002) is a good overview of changing conceptions of the welfare state. There are a number of books that aim to provide a history of the development of social policy provision in the UK. Fraser (2009) goes back to the early roots of policy before the nineteenth century; Lowe (2005) provides an overview of developments in the second half of the last century; and Glennerster (2006) focuses in more detail upon policy changes over the same period. Timmins’s (2001) discussion of post-war welfare policy in the UK is a fascinating study of some of the politics behind the policy process and Hay and Wincott (2012) look at a range of influences on state welfare provision in Europe including the UK. There is a useful website which accompanies the Student’s Companion to Social Policy (Brunsdon and May 2012) at www.blackwellpublishing.com/alcock4e/; and some introductory material on the subject is also contained on a site maintained by Paul Spicker at www2.rgu.ac.uk/publicpolicy/introduction/.

Government documents can be accessed through the general government website at www.gov.uk, or though the individual departmental sites listed in later chapters.
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